REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to the Examiner's Action dated December 23, 2004. Applicants have amended the claims to clarify key features of the invention and overcome the claim objections. No new matter has been added, and the amendments place the claims in better condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments to the claims. The discussion/arguments provided below reference the claims in their amended form.

IN THE SPECIFICATION/ABSTRACT

In the present Office Action, the specification and abstract are objected to because of informalities contained therein. Applicants have amended the specification and abstract to correct these informalities. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments to the specification and abstract and reconsideration of the objections thereto.

CLAIMS OBJECTIONS

In the present Office Action, Claims 1 and 19 are objected to because of informalities. Accordingly, Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 19 to remove those informalities and overcome the claim objections, and Applicants respectfully request removal of the objections to those claims.

CLAIMS REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the present Office Action, Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Nakagawa* (U.S. Patent No. 5,619,696). *Nakagawa* does not anticipate Applicants' claimed invention because *Nakagawa* does not teach (nor suggest) each feature recited by Applicants' claims.

Applicants' invention provides a method, system, and computer program product for allowing an application/user to specify which particular physical (addressable) memory block, among multiple addressable memory blocks, is to be allocated to processes generated when executing the application. The physical address of the desired memory block is pre-programmed, and a process, implemented by a memory allocation utility, iteratively retrieves memory blocks and checks the physical address of each retrieved memory block with the

physical address provided by the application to determine when the physical addresses match. Only the memory block that matches physical address with the pre-programmed/pre-selected physical address is allocated to the application process(es). Other features are provided within Applicants' invention, several of which are recited by the various dependent claims.

The following features are recited by independent Claim 1 (and also Claim 19):

*(1) means for **querying said physical address to determine if it is a programmatically pre-selected physical address desired by said application**, wherein said desired physical address is specified by program code of said application and provided as a parameter value to components carrying out said memory allocation, **which program code forces an ultimate selection of a memory block corresponding to the pre-selected physical address; and***

*(2) means for passing said selected memory block for utilization by said application **only when said physical address matches said desired, pre-selected physical address.***

Independent Claim 15 recites the following:

*(3) receiving a **pre-programmed specific physical memory location** to allocate to processes of an application;...; and*

*(4) responsive to an operation requesting access to memory by said application, automatically assigning said pre-programmed specific physical memory location to said operation, **wherein only said pre-programmed specific physical memory location is assigned to that application.***

Finally, independent Claim 34 recites:

*(5) means for **allocating only pre-selected, specific physical memory locations** to said application processes corresponding to a **pre-programmed physical location/address** specified for the application processes.*

Nakagawa fails to teach or suggest any of the above recited features. In contrast with those and other features of Applicants' invention, *Nakagawa* merely describes associating a physical address of a physical page with both the logical address in a program cache space and the logical address in a process space (Title and Abstract; *see also*, col. 3, lines 44-col. 4, line 5).

A first cited sections of *Nakagawa* describe two storage devices, with the fist device storing the "programs" and the second having physical pages (i.e., memory divided into parts) (col. 5, lines 44-62). Col. 5, lines 62 to col. 6 lines 15 then describe logical addresses, and "memory logical space... separated into a program cache space ... and a process space..."

Col. 8, lines 6-26 describes an external storage device from which an application can be invoked and a memory management element whose function is to "translate the logical address on the memory ... to the physical address of a physical page 48 where ... data are physically stored" using standard address translation.

Col. 8, lines 43-col. 9 lines 12 describes linking store files to a system library, and reading program from external storage and written in a program cache space of the memory the first time the program is invoked (lines 52-55). That section then goes on to describe a save/restore function for information collectively stored in the system common space of memory and storing information necessary to "collectively restore the contents..." Finally, that section describes logical space of the memory and a translation table used to translate physical address of the physical page, where the "memory space include a plurality of process spaces 2a and one system common space 2b."

Nothing in the above sections or anywhere in *Nakagawa* teaches or suggests any of the above highlighted features of Applicants' claims. The standard for a § 102 rejection requires that the reference teach each element recited in the claims set forth within the invention. As clearly outlined above, *Nakagawa* fails to meet this standard and therefore does not anticipate Applicants' invention.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have diligently responded to the Office Action by amending the title, abstract and specification to overcome objections thereto. Applicants have further amended the claims to clarify key features of the invention and overcome claim objections. The amendments overcome the various objections, and the arguments overcome the §102 rejection. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection and issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all claims now pending.

Applicants further respectfully request the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney of record at 512.343.6116 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

Eustace P. Isidore
Reg. No. 56,104
Dillon & Yudell LLP
8911 North Capital of Texas Highway
Suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
512.343.6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)